

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

CHAMBERS OF
ESTHER SALAS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

MARTIN LUTHER KING
COURTHOUSE
50 WALNUT ST.
ROOM 5076
NEWARK, NJ 07101
973-297-4887

July 16, 2025

LETTER ORDER

Re: *Arelis Bonilla v. Spectrum, et al.*
Civil Action No. 24-10664 (ES) (JBC)

Dear Litigants:

On March 19, 2025, The Honorable James B. Clark, U.S.M.J., issued an Order to Show Cause (“OTSC”) providing: (i) pro se Plaintiff Arelis Bonilla (“Plaintiff”) was required to appear, in person, on April 16, 2025, “to show cause why her claims should not be recommended for dismissal”; and (ii) to “submit a written statement outlining why her claims should not be dismissed by no later than **April 3, 2025**.” (D.E. No. 10 at 1) (emphasis in original). Judge Clark further cautioned that, if Plaintiff failed to appear as directed, “the Court may recommend dismissal of [her] claims without further notice.” (*Id.*). Judge Clark also directed defense counsel to serve a copy of the OTSC on Plaintiff via the personal e-mail address she provided when filing this matter in the New Jersey Superior Court. (*Id.* at 1-2; *see also* Compl. D.E. No. 1-2 at 5). The record reflects that Plaintiff neither filed a written submission as directed in the R&R, nor attended the April 16, 2025 hearing.

On May 1, 2025, Judge Clark issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the Court dismiss Plaintiff’s claims *with prejudice* “based on her [her failure] to comply with Court orders and prosecute her case”, in accordance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 37(b)(2) and 41(b). (D.E. No. 11 (“R&R”) at 1, 3). In His Honor’s R&R, Judge Clark recounted Plaintiff’s conduct to date and carefully analyzed the relevant factors that the United States Court of Appeals discussed in *Poulis v. State Farm Casualty Co.*, 747 F.2d 863 (3d Cir. 1984). (R&R at 3–5). Judge Clark provided the parties fourteen days to file and serve objections to the R&R pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(2), and Local Civil Rule 72.1(c)(2). (*Id.* at 5). Any such objections were therefore due by May 15, 2025. Judge Clark also directed both the Clerk of Court and defense counsel to serve copies of the R&R on Plaintiff. (*Id.*). To date, no party has objected to the R&R. Nor has Plaintiff otherwise participated in this matter.

Accordingly, having reviewed the record and Judge Clark’s unopposed R&R, and for the reasons stated therein, and for good cause shown,

IT IS on this 16th day of July, 2025,

ORDERED that Judge Clark's unopposed R&R (D.E. No. 11) is **ADOPTED** in full; and
it is further

ORDERED that all of Plaintiff's claims in this matter are **DISMISSED** *with prejudice*;
and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall **TERMINATE** Docket Entry Number 11; and it
is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall **CLOSE** this case; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff via regular
and certified U.S. Mail, return receipt requested.

s/ Esther Salas

Esther Salas, U.S.D.J.